UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,787	11/24/2003	David William Trepess	450110-04832	4633

7590 05/08/2006

WILLIAM S. FROMMER, Esq.
c/o FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
DWIVEDI, MAHESH H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,787	TREPESS, DAVID WILLIAM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mahesh H. Dwivedi	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/04/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 11/24/2003 and 03/04/2004 have been received, entered into the record, and considered. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The examiner notes that there are numerous spelling errors in the application. The applicant is reminded that all words should be spelled with proper U.S spelling. The examiner notes examples in the specification such as **"programme"** (Paragraph 44) and **"visualisation"** (Paragraph 49).

Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: In claim 28, there is insufficient evidence in the specification for the term **"transmission medium"**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term **"providing medium"** is vague and the examiner notes that it is unclear as to what a **"providing medium"** is.

Claims 27-28 are rejected for incorporating the deficiencies of claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 14-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kohonen et al.** (Article entitled "Self Organization of a Massive Document Collection") and in view of **Derthick** (Article entitled "Interfaces for Palmtop Image Search").

8. Regarding claim 1, **Kohonen** teaches a system comprising:

A) a user control for defining a search criterion for selecting information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6);

B) a detector for detecting those positions within the array of nodes corresponding to the selected information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6); and

C) a graphical user interface for displaying display points which are at positions within a display area on a user display (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that a "keyword search" (Page 584) is analogous to **"a user control for defining a search criterion for selecting information items"**. The examiner further notes that Figure 6 describes an interface which displays retrieved search results based on the search constraint. The examiner further notes that the retrieved results depicted in Figure 6 are analogous to the operation of a **"detector for detecting those positions within the array of nodes corresponding to the selected information items"**.

Kohonen does not explicitly teach:

D) the graphical user interface also displaying in a sequence in time a plurality of representations of the selected information items.

Derthick, however, teaches **"the graphical user interface also displaying in a sequence in time a plurality of representations of the selected information items"** as "RSVP slideshow" (Page 1, Section 2) and Figure 1.

The examiner notes that Figure 1 depicts an RSVP image show on an graphical user interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 2, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein the graphical user interface is operable to display a two-dimensional display array of said display points (Page 574, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "documents are presented as points on a two-dimensional (2-D) plane and the geometric relations of the image points of the documents represent their similarity relations" (Page 574) is analogous to **"wherein the graphical user interface is operable to display a two-dimensional display array of said display points"**.

Regarding claim 3, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) in which the mapping between information items and nodes in the array includes a dither component so that substantially identical information items tend to map to closely spaced but different positions in the array (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that the Figure 6 depicts very similar topics closely coupled together in the large grid.

Regarding claim 4, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) in which the information items are mapped to nodes in the array on the basis of a feature vector derived from each information item (Page 574, Abstract).

The examiner notes that "the feature vectors for the documents statistical representations of their vocabularies are used" (Page 574, Abstract) and "Any of the basic projection methods can be used to organize textual data items, such as documents, if their contents are described statistically as some kind of metric feature vectors" (Page 574, Section B) are analogous to **"in which the mapping between information items and nodes in the array includes a dither component so that substantially identical information items tend to map to closely spaced but different positions in the array"**.

Regarding claim 5, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) in which the feature vector for an information item represents a set of frequencies of occurrence, within that information item, of each of a group of information features (Pages 576, 581).

The examiner notes that "in the basic vector-space model [38] the stored documents are represented as real vectors in which each component corresponds to the frequency of occurrence of a particular word in the document" (Page 576, Section A) is analogous to **"in which the feature vector for an information item represents a set of frequencies of occurrence, within that information item, of each of a group of information features"**.

Regarding claim 6, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) in which the information items comprise textual information, the feature vector for an information item represents a set of frequencies of occurrence, within that information item, of each of a group of words (Pages 576, 581).

The examiner notes that "in the basic vector-space model [38] the stored documents are represented as real vectors in which each component corresponds to the frequency of occurrence of a particular word in the document" (Page 576, Section A) is analogous to **"in which the information items comprise textual information, the feature vector for an information item represents a set of frequencies of occurrence, within that information item, of each of a group of words"**.

Regarding claim 7, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) in which the information items comprise textual information, the nodes being mapped by mutual similarity of at least a part of the textual information (Page 575).

The examiner notes that "The models are produced by a learning process that automatically orders them on the 2-D grid along with their mutual similarity" (Page 575, Section II) is analogous to **"in which the information items comprise textual information, the nodes being mapped by mutual similarity of at least a part of the textual information"**.

Regarding claim 9, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) in which the information items are pre-processed for mapping by excluding words occurring with less than a threshold frequency amongst the set of information items (Page 581).

The examiner notes that "The words occurring less than 50 times in the whole corpus, as well as set of common words in a stopword list of 1335 words were removed" (Page 581, Section A) is analogous to **"in which the information items are pre-processed for mapping by excluding words occurring with less than a threshold frequency amongst the set of information items"**.

Regarding claim 10, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) search means for carrying out a search of the information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6);

B) the search means and the graphical user interface being arranged to co-operate so that only those display points corresponding to information items selected by the search are displayed on the user display (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that a "keyword search" (Page 584) is analogous to **"search means for carrying out a search of the information items"**. The examiner further notes that Figure 6 describes an interface which displays retrieved search results based on the search constraint. The examiner further notes that the retrieved results depicted in Figure 6 are analogous to the operation of a **"the search means and the graphical user interface being arranged to co-operate so that only those display points corresponding to information items selected by the search are displayed on the user display"**.

Regarding claim 11, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:
A) wherein the said sequence in time is a serial visual presentation of the said representations.

Derthick, however, teaches **"wherein the said sequence in time is a serial visual presentation of the said representations"** as "Rapid Serial Visual Presentation" (Page 1, Abstract) and Figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 14, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein a plurality of streams of representations are displayed at the same time in respective display zones.

Derthick, however, teaches **"wherein a plurality of streams of representations are displayed at the same time in respective display zones"** as "Rapid Serial Visual Presentation" (Page 1, Abstract), "large image grid was continuously visible for SD" (Page 1, Section 2) and Figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 15, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) a further user control for selecting a said representation, and causing the display of information related to the selected representation (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

Regarding claim 16, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein the said representation comprise images.

Derthick, however, teaches **"wherein the said representation comprise images"** as "query image" (Page 1,Section 2, Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching

Derthick's would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 17, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) where the said representations comprise text.

Derthick, however, teaches **"where the said representations comprise text"** as "query text" (Page 1,Section 2, Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 18, **Kohonen** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein the said representation comprises links to the information items represented thereby (Page 583, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "clicking a point on the map display with a mouse, links to the document database, enable reading the contents of the documents" (Page 583, Figures 5-6) is analogous to **"wherein the said representation comprises links to the information items represented thereby"**.

Regarding claim 19, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) A portable data processing device comprising a system according to claim

1.

Derthick, however, teaches **"A portable data processing device comprising a system according to claim 1"** as "palmtop interfaces" (Page 1,Section 2, Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 20, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) Video acquisition and/or processing apparatus comprising a system according to claim 1.

Derthick, however, teaches **"Video acquisition and/or processing apparatus comprising a system according to claim 1"** as "video retrieval, our current interfaces segment video into shots, and represent them with single frames" (Page 1,Section 1, Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 21, **Kohonen** teaches a method comprising:

A) defining a search criterion for selecting information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6);

B) detecting those positions within the array of nodes corresponding to the selected information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6); and

C) displaying display points which are at positions within a display area on a user display corresponding to the selected information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6);

The examiner notes that a "keyword search" (Page 584) is analogous to **"defining a search criterion for selecting information items"**. The examiner further notes that Figure 6 describes an interface which displays retrieved search results based on the search constraint. The examiner further notes that the retrieved results depicted in Figure 6 are analogous to the operation of a **"detecting those positions within the array of nodes corresponding to the selected information items"**.

Kohonen does not explicitly teach:

D) the graphical user interface also displaying in a sequence in time a plurality of representations of the selected information items.

Derthick, however, teaches **"the graphical user interface also displaying in a sequence in time a plurality of representations of the selected information items"** as "RSVP slideshow" (Page 1, Section 2) and Figure 1.

The examiner notes that Figure 1 depicts an RSVP image show on an graphical user interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 22, **Kohonen** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the step of displaying displays a two-dimensional display array of said display points (Page 574, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "documents are presented as points on a two-dimensional (2-D) plane and the geometric relations of the image points of the documents represent their similarity relations" (Page 574) is analogous to **"wherein the step of displaying displays a two-dimensional display array of said display points"**.

Regarding claim 23, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the said sequence in time is a serial visual presentation of the said representations.

Derthick, however, teaches **"wherein the said sequence in time is a serial visual presentation of the said representations"** as "Rapid Serial Visual Presentation" (Page 1, Abstract) and Figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 24, **Kohonen** further teaches a method comprising:

A) a further user control for selecting a said representation, and causing the display of information related to the selected representation (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

Regarding claim 25, **Kohonen** further teaches a method comprising:

A) Computer software having program code for carrying out a method according to claim 21 (Page 575, Section B, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "develop the final software for our method" (Page 575, Section B) and "our system operate in real time and fit medium-sized computers" (Page 575, Section B) are analogous to **"Computer software having program code for carrying out a method according to claim 21"**.

Regarding claim 26, **Kohonen** further teaches a method comprising:

A) A providing medium for providing program code according to claim 25 (Page 575, Section B, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "develop the final software for our method" (Page 575, Section B) and "our system operate in real time and fit medium-sized computers" (Page 575, Section B) are analogous to **"A providing medium for providing program code according to claim 25"**.

Regarding claim 27, **Kohonen** further teaches a method comprising:

A) A medium according to claim 26, the medium being a storage medium (Page 575, Section B, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that "medium-sized computers" (Page 575, Section B) have a **"storage medium"**.

Regarding claim 28, **Kohonen** further teaches a method comprising:

A) A medium according to claim 26, the medium being a transmission medium (Page 575, Section B, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that it is common knowledge that "medium-sized computers" (Page 575, Section B) have a **"transmission medium"**.

Regarding claim 29, **Kohonen** teaches a interface comprising:

A) a user control for defining a search criterion for selecting information items (Page 584, Figure 6); and

B) a graphical user interface having a display area arranged to display points which are at positions within a display area corresponding to the selected information items (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that a "keyword search" (Page 584) is analogous to **"a user control for defining a search criterion for selecting information items"**. The examiner further notes that Figure 6 describes an interface which displays retrieved search results based on the search constraint.

Kohonen does not explicitly teach:

C) a display area arranged to display in a sequence in time a plurality of representations of the selected information items.

Derthick, however, teaches **"a display area arranged to display in a sequence in time a plurality of representations of the selected information items"** as "RSVP slideshow" (Page 1, Section 2) and Figure 1.

The examiner notes that Figure 1 depicts an RSVP image show on an graphical user interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 30, **Kohonen** further teaches a interface comprising:
A) wherein graphical user interface displays a two-dimensional display array of said display points (Page 574, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "documents are presented as points on a two-dimensional (2-D) plane and the geometric relations of the image points of the documents represent their similarity relations" (Page 574) is analogous to **"wherein graphical user interface displays a two-dimensional display array of said display points"**.

Regarding claim 31, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a interface comprising:
A) wherein the said sequence in time is a serial visual presentation of the said representations.

Derthick, however, teaches **"wherein the said sequence in time is a serial visual presentation of the said representations"** as "Rapid Serial Visual Presentation" (Page 1, Abstract) and Figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

Regarding claim 32, **Kohonen** further teaches a interface comprising:

A) a further user control for selecting a said representation, and causing the display of information related to the selected representation (Page 584, Figures 5-6).

Regarding claim 33, **Kohonen** further teaches a interface comprising:

A) a user control for applying further search criteria to the search (Pages 583-584, Figures 5-6).

The examiner notes that "If the map is large, subsets of it can first be viewed by zooming" (Pages 583, Section E) is analogous to **"a user control for applying further search criteria to the search"**.

Regarding claim 34, **Kohonen** does not explicitly teach a interface comprising:

A) A) a presentation control for controlling the presentation of the said sequence of representations.

Derthick, however, teaches **"a presentation control for controlling the presentation of the said sequence of representations"** as "very large scrollbar" (Page 1, Section 2, Figure 1) and "countdown timer" (Page 1, Section 2, Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for having an efficient multiple image retrieval based on RSVP premises, as noted by **Derthick** (Abstract).

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kohonen et al.** (Article entitled "Self Organization of a Massive Document Collection") and in view of **Derthick** (Article entitled "Interfaces for Palmtop Image Search") as applied to claims 1-7, 9-11, and 14-34, and further in view of **Doerre et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,446,061).

10. Regarding claim 8, **Kohonen** and **Derthick** do not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) in which the information items are pre-processed for mapping by excluding words occurring with more than a threshold frequency amongst the set of information items.

Bruijn, however, teaches **"in which the information items are pre-processed for mapping by excluding words occurring with more than a threshold frequency amongst the set of information items"** as a solution to this problem the invention suggests to use names, terms, and general words, but to apply filtering to remove high-frequency terms and very low-frequency terms (Column 18, lines 45-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** and **Doerre's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method to prevent cluster coherence at the expense of meaningful cluster descriptors, as noted by **Doerre** (Column 18, lines 41-44).

11. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kohonen et al.** (Article entitled "Self Organization of a Massive Document Collection") and in view of **Derthick** (Article entitled "Interfaces for Palmtop Image Search") as applied to claims 1-7, 9-11, and 14-34, and further in view of **Bruijn et al.** (Article entitled "Patterns of Eye Gaze during Rapid Serial Visual Presentation").

12. Regarding claim 12, **Kohonen** and **Derthick** do not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein the said representations are displayed one at a time in sequence in the same display zone.

Bruijn, however, teaches **"wherein the said representations are displayed one at a time in sequence in the same display zone"** as "Keyhole RSVP" (Pages 1-2, Section I) and "We use the term Keyhole RSVP when all the images appear, in rapid sequence, in the same location at the same size" (Pages 1-2, Section I).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** and **Bruijn's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for multiple ways to express different RSVP configurations.

Regarding claim 13, **Kohonen** and **Derthick** do not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein a plurality of said representations are displayed at the same time in respective display zones.

Bruijn, however, teaches **"wherein a plurality of said representations are displayed at the same time in respective display zones"** as "Collage RSVP" (Page 2, Section I) and "a set of images being deposited, in rapid sequence, on a table top in such a way that five or six are visible at any one time" (Page 2, Section I).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Derthick's** and **Bruijn's** would have allowed **Kohonen's** to provide a method for multiple ways to express different RSVP configurations.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 6,865,572 issued to **Boguraev et al.** on 08 March 2005. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-34 (e.g., methods to use clusters in RSVP imagining).

U.S. Patent 6,626,862 issued to **Lundahl et al.** on 21 October 2003. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-34 (e.g., methods to use SOM mapping).

U.S. PGPUB 2003/0208485 issued to **Castellanos** on 06 November 2003. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-34 (e.g., methods to use SOM mapping).

U.S. Patent 7,017,186 issued to **Day** on 21 March 2006. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-34 (e.g., methods to use SOM mapping).

U.S. PGPUB 2005/0027704 issued to **Hammond et al.** on 03 February 2005. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-34 (e.g., methods to use preprocess words from documents).

U.S. Patent 5,864846 issued to **Voorhees et al.** on 26 January 1999. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1-34 (e.g., methods to use preprocess words from documents).

Contact Information

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mahesh Dwivedi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2731. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:20 am – 4:40 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached (571) 272-3642. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mahesh Dwivedi

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2168

MD

April 26, 2006

Leslie Wong

Primary Examiner